



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/583,571

06/19/2006

Michel Leger

09669/091001

8880

22511 7590 03/03/2009

OSHA LIANG L.L.P.  
TWO HOUSTON CENTER  
909 FANNIN, SUITE 3500  
HOUSTON, TX 77010

EXAMINER

CALLAHAN, PAUL E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2437

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/03/2009

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@oshaliang.com  
buta@oshaliang.com



### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is directed towards the Applicant's response filed 11-20-2008. Claims 1-15 are pending and have been examined.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokoyama, US 6,279,825 (Submitted with the Applicant's IDS), Parsons et al., US 7,121,460, and Devanbu et al., US 6,098,170

As for claim 1, Yokoyama teaches a secure terminal (abstract) comprising: principal means processing means, memories for storing data and programs, and a keypad for entering data (fig. 2, col. 4 lines 33-61), wherein elements constituting said principal means being interconnected by a first data bus and are combined in a protected box which is impossible to dismantle without

Art Unit: 2437

deterioration of at least one element of said principal means (fig. 2, fig. 3, col. 4 line 61 through col. 6 line 65, see esp. col. 5 lines 15-25 "fine wiring"); and peripheral means comprising: means of reading from/writing to a card means of access to a telecommunications network (fig. 2, col. 4 lines 33-61), and power supply unit for supplying power to the principal means and the peripheral means (col. 4 lines 4-50), wherein elements constituting said peripheral means being interconnected by a second data bus and are combined in a non protected box (fig. 2, fig. 3, col. 4 line 62 through col. 6 line 65). Yokoyama does not explicitly disclose a peripheral that is a printer. However Parsons does disclose a secure ATM where a non-secure peripheral that is a printer is shown (fig. 7: "Output Devices", col. 5 lines 40-55). Therefore it would have been obvious to incorporate this feature into the system of Yokoyama. It would have been desirable to do so since this would allow the user to obtain a hard copy receipt for transactions made at the ATM. The combination of Yokohama and Parsons does not explicitly disclose that the first and second boxes are connected by means of a single connector disposed to enable communication between the first data bus and the second data bus. However Devanbu et al. does teach a secure processor enclosed in a tamper proof box that has a single communications input port (bus connector) that allows communications between a first and second bus (fig. 4, col. 6 lines 22-32). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this feature into the system of Yokoyama and Parsons. It would have been obvious to do so since this would increase the difficulty in stealing data from the secure processor.

As for claim 2, Yokoyama discloses the secure terminal according to claim 1, wherein the peripheral means further comprises means of display (fig. 1 element 101, col. 4 lines 25-30).

As for claim 3, Yokoyama discloses the secure terminal according to claim 2, wherein the means of display communicates with the principal means by an exchange of encrypted data (fig. 2, fig. 2, col. 4 lines 31-61).

As for claim 4, Yokoyama discloses the secure terminal according to claim 1, wherein the principal means also comprises means of display (fig. 1, col. 4 lines 20-45)

As for claim 5, Yokoyama discloses the secure terminal according to claim 4, wherein the means of display are not certified from the point of view of security (fig. 3, col. 4 line 62 through col. 6 line 65).

As for claim 6, Yokoyama discloses the secure terminal according to claim 1, wherein the means the processing means, the memories, and the keypad are not certified from the point of view of security (fig. 3, col. 4 line 62 through col. 6 line 65).

As for claim 7, Yokoyama discloses the secure terminal according to claim 1, in which the means of reading from/writing to a card and the means of access to a telecommunication network are not certified from the point of view of security (fig. 3, col. 4 line 62 through col. 6 line 65). Yokoyama does not explicitly disclose a peripheral that is a printer. However Parsons does disclose a secure ATM where a non-secure peripheral that is a printer is shown (fig. 7: "Output Devices", col. 5 lines 40-55). Therefore it would have been obvious to incorporate this feature into the system of Yokoyama. It would have been desirable to do so since this would allow the user to obtain a hard copy receipt for transactions made at the ATM.

As for claims 8-14, the claims recite substantially the same limitations as claims 1-7 and are rejected on the same basis as those claims.

As for claim 15, the combination of Yokoyama and Parsons does not explicitly the secure terminal according to claim 1, wherein the protected box is detachable from the first non protected box by the single connector to attach the protected box to a second non protected box. However Devanbu et al. does teach a feature (single port interface fig. 4, col. 6 lines 22-32). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this feature into the system of Yokoyama and Parsons. It would have been obvious to do so since this would allow for easier access to the components for replacement or maintenance.

***Conclusion***

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul E. Callahan whose telephone number is (571) 272-3869. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9 to 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise, can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is: (571) 273-8300.

Art Unit: 2437

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Paul Callahan/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2437

/Nasser G Moazzami/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2436